

REMARKS

In the final Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-10, 16-19, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161918 to Asano; and rejected claims 2-5, 11-14, and 20-23 as being unpatentable over Asano in view of applicant admitted prior art.

Applicants propose to amend claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-20 and 25-28, cancel claims 21-23, and add claims 29-32. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-5, 7-14, 16-20 and 25-32 are pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 7-10, 16-19, and 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Asano.

Independent claim 1 recites a device-to-device authentication system comprising a local environment management unit configured to determine when a local area network of a first device and a local area network of a second device are the same local area network, wherein the first device comprises:

a unit configured to receive a request for access from the second device;

a unit configured to permit the request when it is determined that the first device and the second device are on the same local area network; and

a unit configured to refuse the request when it is not determined that the first device and the second device are on the same local area network

Asano and the AAPA, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed first device.

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Asano teaches a method for transmitting a packet between a first host and a second host via a router. (Abstract). This method compares a destination MAC address with the MAC address of the router. ¶ [0028]. If they are not the same, the router discards the packet. *Id.* If they are the same, the router uses a destination IP address to replace the existing destination MAC address with a destination MAC address for the destination IP address. *Id.*

The background of the present application discloses that “it is considered that it is appropriate for the client terminal on the home network to make free use of the legitimately acquired contents in the home server.” (Specification, p. 3). However, the background goes on to state:

With a current technique . . . it is difficult to determine whether a client terminal logging into the home network is within the scope of private use or not.

For example, since the home network is interconnected to an external network via a router based on an IP protocol, the home server does not know where a client making access actually is.

Id.

Asano and the AAPA, alone or in combination, fail teach or suggest a device-to-device authentication system comprising a local environment management unit configured to determine when a local area network of a first device and a local area network of a second device are the same local area network, wherein the first device comprises:

a unit configured to receive a request for access from the second device;

a unit configured to permit the request when it is determined that the first device and the second device are on the same local area network; and

a unit configured to refuse the request when it is not determined that the first device and the second device are on the same local area network

Accordingly, Asano and the AAPA fail to anticipate or render obvious claim 1.

Independent claims 7, 10, 16, 19, 25, 28, and 29 and dependent claims 2-5, 8, 9, 11-14, 17, 18, 20, 26, 27, and 30-32 while different in scope than claim 1, are not anticipated for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicants request entry of the amendments as placing the application in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 17, 2008

By: /Michael R. Kelly/
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921